ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Kia America, Inc. v. ARIF YANTO SAPUTRO
Case No. D2026-3063

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kia America, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Buchalter LLP, United States.

The Respondent is ARIF YANTO SAPUTRO, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kiafund.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 11, 2026. On July 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (None provided / Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 21, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is an automotive company that offers a range of gasoline, hybrid, plug-in hybrid and electric vehicles sold through a network of over 800 automotive dealerships in the United States. The Complainant is the exclusive United States distributor of Kia vehicles and licensee of numerous KIA and KIA-formative marks owned by Kia Corporation, based in the Republic of Korea.

The Complainant owns KIA-formative marks and trademark registrations in its own name, and Kia Corporation also owns thousands of KIA and KIA-formative marks and trademark registrations in the United States, the Republic of Korea, and throughout the world in connection with vehicles and related goods and services including, the United States trademark registration for KIA (wordmark) with registration number 1723608, registered on October 13, 1992 for, inter alia, tires, bicycles, trucks, and motorcycles in international Class 12.

The Complainant's official website can be found at "www.kia.com". The corresponding domain name was registered in 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 4, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint and while rendering this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website consisting of a straightforward, largely text-based interface featuring a menu of links to Kia financing-related content, including vehicle models, loan calculators, credit information, and special financing offers. At the time of rendering this decision, the links to further content were all broken.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following:

The Complainant is a well-known United States automotive company. In 2025, the Complainant sold over 850,000 Kia vehicles in the United Sates. Kia vehicles regularly win industry awards such as the "best 3-Row Electric Vehicle" by Kelley Blue Book.

The disputed domain name incorporates KIA trademark in its entirety while adding the generic term "fund" which suggests the retail financing services offered by the Complainant in connection with vehicle leases and sales. This makes the disputed domain name even more confusingly similar to the KIA trademark. The disputed domain name is, moreover, confusingly similar to the Complainant's KIA trademark and the Complainants' official website.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and is not known by "kiafund.com" nor could the Respondent have developed any common-law trademark rights. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant or its licensor, nor has the Complainant licensed or permitted the Respondent to use the KIA trademark.

Instead, the Respondent has engaged in a typical act of domain name hijacking by merely adding, "fund", to the KIA trademark, resulting in the misleading disputed domain name. The Internet's user likely attempting to access information about the Complainant or its KIA brand or its services, will mistakenly enter the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name has not been used for any legitimate or good faith purposes. The Respondent seems to be engaged in a textbook case of bad faith domain name hijacking. The Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark prior to registering the disputed domain name. Further, it is evidenced that the Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, the Internet's user to the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant. The disputed domain name uses the KIA trademark in its entirety and the website to which the disputed domain name resolves repeatedly uses a number of the Complainant's trademarks.

Moreover, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves purports to provide information relating to financing KIA-branded automobiles, which is a service also offered by the Complainant.

Finally, based on a number of suspicious links previously appearing on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, it appears that the Respondent has engaged, or has attempted to engage, in a phishing scam.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1. Also a trademark owner's affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the Policy for purposes of standing to file a complaint. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.4.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "fund", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In addition, UDRP panels have found that even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds that the website at the disputed domain name suggests that it resolves to an official website of the trademark owner providing services the Complainant also offers. Even if it would be necessary to apply the so-called "Oki Data test", e.g. if the website would actually be offering the KIA products or services, the criterion that the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder, is not met. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1.

To the contrary, the Panel finds that the website, also in light of the unrebutted arguments brought forward by the Complainant, can be considered as an attempt to pass off as the Complainant or affiliated with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under 6.B.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent, given the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, has been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks and intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, by creating an "official" website passing off as the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, in particular the contents of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <kiafund.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/
Willem J. H. Leppink
Sole Panelist
Date: September 8, 2026.